

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Prior to this Submission, Claims 1-16 were pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 10 being independent. Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Examiner still finds allowable subject matter in Claims 9 and 14.

As indicated above, Claims 1, 9-10, and 14 have been amended, and new Claims 17-20 have been added. No new matter has been presented. Claims 1-20 are now pending, with Claims 1 and 10 as independent claims.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-8, 10-13, and 15-16 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takada (U.S. 5,850,477) in view of Sachs et al. (U.S. 5,956,034). Additionally, as indicated above, Claims 9 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 10, the Examiner asserts that Takada teaches all the recitations of these claims, except for resizing the entry field to be suitable for the input data's size whenever input data is input to the generated entry field, which is allegedly taught in Sachs.

Again, the Examiner refers to FIG. 12B of Takada, interpreting the division of the handwritten stroke data 51, which is originally contained in a rectangular region 52, into two separate pieces of stroke data 53 and 54, which subsequently divides the rectangular region 52 into two regions, as being an equivalent of an entry field generating portion for generating at least one

displayed entry field inside a boundary line when the user draws the boundary line for forming an entry frame.

As indicated above, Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite that the displayed entry field is substantially surrounded by a boundary line drawn by a user. As illustrated in FIG. 12 B of Takada, a user draws a vertical line within a text box to divide the text box into two text boxes. Since the only line drawn by the user according to this method is a vertical dividing line, this line does not surround the divided text on either side of the line.

Neither the rectangular region 52, nor the divided rectangular region 52, in Takada is an equivalent of at least one displayed entry field surrounded by a boundary line. Rather, the rectangular region 52 is merely illustrated in Takada for better explaining how Takada divides already input handwritten stroke data 51. That is, the rectangular region 52 is theoretically generated after the stroke data 51 is input. The rectangular region 52 in Takada is not an equivalent of an entry field surrounded by a boundary line drawn by a user. Input data is input to the generated entry field in independent Claims 1 and 10, but not in the rectangular region 52 in Takada, which is merely a representation of a perimeter around already input stroke data 51.

Further, the process for dividing the input stroke data 51 into two separate pieces of stroke data 53 and 54 also does not generate at least one displayed entry field surrounded by a boundary line, wherein input data is input to the generated entry field. Instead, after the stroke data 51 is input, Takada calculates a perimeter of the stroke data 51, and then divides the input stroke data 51 into two separate pieces of stroke data 53 and 54. No entry field is generated inside an area surrounded by a boundary line, wherein input data is input to the generated entry field.

Basically, FIG. 12B of Takada merely divides already input stroke data 51 into two separate pieces of stroke data 53 and 54. Takada does not generate at least one displayed entry field

substantially surrounded a boundary line, wherein input data is input into the generated entry field, as is recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 10.

Additionally, Sachs fails to cure this deficiency of Takada.

Further, the Examiner admits that Takada fails to teach resizing the entry field to be suitable for the input data's size whenever input data is input to the generated entry field, but asserts that this recitation is taught in Sachs. Applicants respectfully disagree as Sachs merely teaches that the size of the font of text 110 is displayed and can then be enlarged or reduced.

More specifically, Sachs teaches changing the size of the fonts for previously input data, but fails to teach or suggest resizing an entry field. Referring to FIG. 3B, Sachs merely teaches selecting "change font" icon 122 to change the current font size.

Further, *Sachs* clearly states in col. 6, lines 16-18 that a font size is changed when the icon 122 is pressed by the user. However, Sachs fails to teach or suggest that the entry field is resized whenever input data is input to the generated entry field, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10.

Accordingly, Sachs fails to cure the admitted deficiencies of Takada.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 10 are patentably distinct over Takada in view of Sachs, and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of amended independent Claims 1 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Regarding new dependent Claims 17 and 19, these claims include the limitation, "the generated entry field is resized according to whether the data input to the generated entry field

extends beyond a boundary of the generated entry field.” For example, steps 240 and 250 of FIG.2 of the present application refer to determining end points of handwritten strokes and automatically resizing an entry field accordingly, so input handwritten text can be recognized, even when the stroke data exceeds the original boundaries of the entry field before resizing. (see Specification, page 11, line 12- page 12, line 12; FIGs. 2 and 4). Takada and Sachs do not teach, disclose, or suggest, alone or in combination, the above-quoted limitation of new Claims 17 and 19. Accordingly, dependent Claims 17 and 19 are patentable over Sachs and Takada.

Regarding new dependent Claims 18 and 20, these claims include the limitation, “wherein the generated entry field is displayed as an empty entry field.” For example, FIG. 3 of the present application illustrates a case where a user draws boundary lines in the upper part of FIG.3, while the lower part of FIG. 3 illustrates entry fields generated according to the drawn boundary lines, which includes empty entry fields. Sachs and Takada do not teach, disclose, or suggest this feature of the present application. More specifically, FIG. 12B of Takada, which is cited by the Examiner in the rejections of the claims, illustrates a case where text boxes generated after the user draws a vertical dividing line are not empty. Therefore, Takada does not teach, disclose, or suggest this feature. Sachs does not cure the deficiencies of Takada. Therefore, Takada and Sachs do not teach, disclose, or suggest, alone or in combination, all of the limitations of new Claims 18 and 20. Accordingly, dependent Claims 18 and 20 are patentable over Sachs and Takada.

While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 2-9 and 11-20 are also allowable for at least being dependent upon independent Claims 1 and 10, respectively.

PATENT APPLICATION
Attorney Docket No: 678-1104 (P10576)

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-20, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475